

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE                     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 09/862,585      | 05/23/2001                      | Terry Hermanson      | 1907.P124             | 8392             |
| 5514            | 7590 02/05/2004                 |                      | EXAMINER              |                  |
|                 | ICK CELLA HARPER<br>ELLER PLAZA | CHAN, KO HUNG        |                       |                  |
|                 | K, NY 10112                     |                      | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER |                  |
|                 |                                 |                      | 3632                  |                  |

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| _   | Advisory Action   | Application No.                         | Applicant(s)                                  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
|   |   | 09/862,585                              | TERRY HERMANSON .                             |  |  |  |
|   |   | Examiner                                | Art Unit                                      |  |  |  |
|   |   | Korie H. Chan                           | 3632  |  |  |  |
| 7   | he MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c       | correspondence address                        |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 24 December 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the<br>issues for appeal; and/or   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 3.☐ Appl  | icant's reply has overcome the following rejec  | etion(s):                               |   |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   | a)[☐ affidavit, b)[☐ exhibit, or c)[☑ request fo ication in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>  |   | sidered but does NOT place the                |  |  |  |
|   | The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. |   |   |  |  |  |
| 7. For p  | ourposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment<br>anation of how the new or amended claims w  | • | •   |  |  |  |
| The   | status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Clai  | Claim(s) allowed:   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) objected to:   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   | Claim(s) rejected:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| Clai  | m(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 8. The  | The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note   | ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:  |   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   |   |   | Korie H. Chan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3632 |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

*> •* 

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 09/862,585

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's argument that the telescoping member would not have required adjustment since the clamps 22 and 26 being each attached to each telescoping member would have been secured to limbs or branches of the tree. Indeed, the chances of the telescoping member sliding with each other exist even with the clamps mounted on the limbs or branches of the tree which has the tendency to sway or move when something or someone accidentally bumps into the tree or when ornaments are being placed onto the tree. Consequently one of ordinary skill would have motivated to place locking means to fix the telescoping members. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.